

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-20 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 9 have been currently amended. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims. Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Feldmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,329, “Feldmann”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. However, Claims 1 and 9 have been currently amended.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, is original Claim 2 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and is thus allowable (Office Action, page 3, lines 1-3).

Independent Claim 9, as amended, is original Claim 10 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and is thus allowable (Office Action, page 3, lines 1-3).

Claims 3-8 and 11-16 depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are therefore allowable due to their dependence.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Patent Office has allowed Claims 17-20 (Office Action, page 2, bottom line).

The Patent Office has indicated that original Claims 2, 7-8, 10 and 15-16 “would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims” (Office Action, page 3, lines 2-3).

As indicated above, independent Claim 1, as amended, is original Claim 2 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and is thus allowable (Office Action, page 3, lines 1-3). Independent Claim 9, as amended, is original Claim 10 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and is thus allowable (Office Action, page 3, lines 1-3). Claims 7-8 and 15-16 depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are therefore allowable due to their dependence.

Applicants understood that the reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter given by the Patent Office at Page 3 of Office Action were made in accordance with the following instruction per MPEP § 1302.14:

“The statement is not intended to necessarily state all the reasons for allowance or all the details why claims are allowed and should not be written to specifically or impliedly state that all the reasons for allowance are set forth.”

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in the case.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of  
LSI Logic Corporation,

Dated: February 8, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Peng Zhu  
Reg. No. 48,063

SUITER • WEST PC LLO  
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220  
Omaha, NE 68154  
(402) 496-0300      telephone  
(402) 496-0333      facsimile